



On the number of irreducible components of commuting varieties

Roberta Basili

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Perugia, Via Vanvitelli 1, 06123 Perugia, Italy

Received 27 September 1998

Communicated by L. Robbiano

Abstract

We will show that for any n and $h, k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $h \leq k$ the variety of all the pairs (A, B) of $n \times n$ matrices over an algebraically closed field K such that $[A, B] = 0$, $\text{rank } A \leq k$, $\text{rank } B \leq h$ has $\min\{h, n - k\} + 1$ irreducible components. Similarly, the corresponding variety of symmetric matrices is reducible if $h, k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ (while it is irreducible if h is 0 and if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and k is n); if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and h, k are even the corresponding variety of antisymmetric matrices is reducible if $h, k \in \{2, \dots, n - 1\}$ (while it is irreducible if h is 0 and if $\text{char } K = 0$ and k is n or $n - 1$). © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

MSC: 15A30; 14L30

1. Introduction

We denote by $M(n, K)$ the Lie algebra of all $n \times n$ matrices over an algebraically closed field K , by $S(n, K)$ and $A(n, K)$, respectively, its subspace of all the symmetric matrices and its Lie subalgebra of all the antisymmetric matrices. We regard these spaces as affine spaces and, for $h, k = 0, \dots, n$, we set:

$$\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h} = \{(A, B) : A, B \in M(n, K), [A, B] = 0, \text{rank } A \leq k, \text{rank } B \leq h\},$$

$$\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k, h} = \mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap (S(n, K) \times S(n, K)),$$

$$\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k, h} = \mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap (A(n, K) \times A(n, K)).$$

E-mail address: basili@dipmat.unipg.it (R. Basili).

We may assume $h \leq k$. In [1] we proved the following theorems.

Theorem 1.1. $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{n,h}$ is irreducible of dimension $n^2 + h$ for all n and $h = 0, \dots, n$. $\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{n,h}$ is irreducible of dimension $n(n+1)/2 + h$ for all n and $h = 0, \dots, n$ if $\text{char } K \neq 2$, for all n and $h = 0$ if $\text{char } K = 2$.

Theorem 1.2. $\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{n,h}$ is irreducible for all n and $h = 0, \dots, n$ if $\text{char } K = 0$, for all n and $h = 0, 1$ if $\text{char } K \neq 2$. If h is even it has dimension $n(n-1)/2 + h/2$.

The irreducibility of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{n,n}$ was before proved in [6] and in [11]. In [14] this result was extended to any reductive Lie algebra over a field K of characteristic 0, so including the irreducibility of $\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{n,n}$. The irreducibility and other properties of $\mathcal{S}(n, k)_{n,n}$ and of some generalizations of it were proved in [2]. In [13] many properties of more general “commuting varieties” were proved, including the irreducibility and the normality of $\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{n,n}$, which was proved also in [3] of some varieties having $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{n,n}$ as a particular case was studied in [8], [9], [12] and in [7].

We denote by $M(n, K)_h$ the variety of all $A \in M(n, K)$ such that $\text{rank } A \leq h$ and set $S(n, K)_h = S(n, K) \cap M(n, K)_h$, $A(n, K)_h = A(n, K) \cap M(n, K)_h$. The following result is due to Kempf [10], see also [1, Theorem 2.1] and to Weyl [16], De Concini and Procesi [4].

Theorem 1.3 (Kempf [10]). $M(n, K)_h$, $S(n, K)_h$ and $A(n, K)_h$ are irreducible varieties of dimension $2nh - h^2$, $nh - h(h-1)/2$ and, if h is even, $nh - h(h+1)/2$, respectively.

If $h = 0$ (or $h = 1$ if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ for antisymmetric matrices) the varieties $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k,h}$, $\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k,h}$ and $\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k,h}$ are irreducible by Theorem 1.3.

For any $A \in M(n, K)$ let $p_A(x) \in K[x]$ be the minimum polynomial of A and let L_A be the corresponding endomorphism of K^n . For $k = 0, \dots, n$ let

$$Z(n, K)_k = \{A \in M(n, K)_k : \text{rank } A = k, p_A(x) = f(x) \text{ or} \\ p_A(x) = xf(x), \text{ where } f(x) \in K[x], f(0) \neq 0\}.$$

By the elimination theorem $Z(n, K)_k$ is an open subset of $M(n, K)_k$. We set

$$\mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h} = \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k,h} : A \in Z(n, K)_k\}$$

and for $t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n-k\}$ we set

$$\mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k,h} = \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h} : \dim(\ker L_A \cap \ker L_B) \geq n - k - t, \\ \text{rank } (AB) \leq h - t\}.$$

We will prove the following results.

Theorem 1.4. *For all n and $h, k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $h \leq k$ the irreducible components of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$ are $\overline{\mathcal{Z}^t(n, k)_{k, h}}$, $t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}$. They have dimension $2nk - k^2 + 2(n - k)t - t^2 + h - t$.*

Theorem 1.5. *For all n and $h, k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ $\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k, h}$ is reducible; if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ $\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k, h}$ is reducible for all $h, k \in \{2, \dots, n - 1\}$ if n is even, for all $h, k \in \{2, \dots, n - 2\}$ if n is odd.*

2. The reducibility of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$, $\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k, h}$ and $\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k, h}$

Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 will be a consequence of the following two propositions.

Proposition 2.1. *The irreducible components of $\mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k, h}$ are $\mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$, $t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}$; they have dimension $2nk - k^2 + 2(n - k)t - t^2 + h - t$. Moreover, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k, h} = \bigcup_{t \in \{0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}\}} (\mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap \mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}),$$

where each term of this union is not contained in the union of the others and if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ it is irreducible. If $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and h, k, t, t' are even we have

$$\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k, h} = \bigcup_{t \in \{0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}\}} (\mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k, h} \cap \mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}),$$

where each term of this union is not contained in the union of the others and if $\text{char } K = 0$ it is irreducible.

Proposition 2.2. *For any $h, k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ $\mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k, h}$ is a dense subset of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$.*

In the proof of Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 we will use the following two lemmas. They were proved by Turnbull and Aitken [15, Chapter X] and by Gantmacher [5, Chapter VIII, Section 2].

Lemma 2.3 (Turnbull and Aitken [15]). *Let $A \in M(n, K)$ be a block diagonal matrix whose diagonal blocks are A_1, \dots, A_k where $A_i \in M(n_i, K)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $p_{A_1}(x), \dots, p_{A_k}(x)$ are relatively prime. If $B \in Z_A$ then B is a block diagonal matrix whose diagonal blocks B_1, \dots, B_k are such that $B_i \in M(n_i, K)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Lemma 2.4 (Turnbull and Aitken [15]). *Let $N \in M(n, K)$ be nilpotent; let $u_1 \geq \dots \geq u_t$ be the orders of the Jordan blocks of N and $\Delta = \{v_j^{u_j-1}, \dots, v_j^0, j = 1, \dots, t\}$ be a basis of K^n such that the matrix of L_N with respect to Δ is in Jordan canonical form (then $v_j^r = L_N^r v_j^0$ for $r = 1, \dots, u_j - 1$). Let us regard the matrix of L_A with respect to Δ as*

a block matrix $(A_{jk})_{j,k}$, $j, k = 1, \dots, t$, where A_{jk} is an $u_j \times u_k$ matrix. Then $A \in Z_N$ if and only if for any $j, k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $j \geq k$ A_{jk} and A_{kj} have the following form:

$$A_{jk} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & a_{jk}^1 & a_{jk}^2 & \dots & a_{jk}^{u_j} \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & a_{jk}^1 & \dots & a_{jk}^{u_j-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 & a_{jk}^1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_{kj} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{kj}^1 & a_{kj}^2 & \dots & a_{kj}^{u_j} \\ 0 & a_{kj}^1 & \dots & a_{kj}^{u_j-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a_{kj}^1 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where for $u_j = u_k$ we omit the first $u_k - u_j$ columns and the last $u_k - u_j$ rows, respectively.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let

$$\mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h} = \left\{ (A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k,h} : \begin{aligned} A &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A' \end{pmatrix}, \\ B &= \begin{pmatrix} B'' & 0 \\ 0 & B' \end{pmatrix}, A', B' \in M(k, K), \det A' \neq 0 \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.3 $(A, B) \in \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h}$ if and only if there exists $G \in GL(n, K)$ such that $(G^{-1}AG, G^{-1}BG) \in \mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h}$. By [5, Chapter XI, Section 3, Corollary 2, Section 4, Corollary] if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}(n, K)_{k,h}$ or $\text{char } K \neq 2$, h, k are even and $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A}(n, K)_{k,h}$ then $(A, B) \in \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h}$ if and only if there exists $O \in SO(n, K)$ such that $(O^tAO, O^tBO) \in \mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h}$.

Since $\mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h}$ is the union of the following subvarieties:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}^t(n, K)_{k,h} &= \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h} : \text{rank } B'' \leq t, \text{rank } B' \leq h - t\} \\ &= \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{V}(n, K)_{k,h} : \dim(\ker L_A \cap \ker L_B) \geq n - k - t, \\ &\quad \text{rank}(AB) \leq h - t\}, \quad t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}, \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h}$ is the union of the subvarieties $\mathcal{V}^t(n, K)_{k,h}$, $t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}$. But for any $t \in \{0, \dots, \min\{h, n - k\}\}$ the set

$$\{(A, B) \in \mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k,h} : \dim(\ker L_A \cap \ker L_B) \leq n - k - t, \text{rank}(AB) \geq h - t\}$$

is a non-empty open subset of $\mathcal{Z}(n, K)_{k, h}$ which has empty intersection with

$$\bigcup_{t' \in (\{0, \dots, \min\{h, n-k\}\} \setminus \{t\})} \mathcal{Z}^{t'}(n, K)_{k, h}.$$

By Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 for $t = 0, \dots, \min\{h, n-k\}$ the variety $\mathcal{V}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$ is irreducible. Since $\mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$ is the image of a morphism from $\mathrm{GL}(n, K) \times \mathcal{V}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$, it is irreducible.

Let us consider the projection of $\mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$ on $Z(n, K)_k$. If A belongs to the open subset of $Z(n, K)_k$ of all the matrices which have $k+1$ different eigenvalues then the irreducible components of the fiber of A have dimension $2(n-k)t - t^2 + h - t$. Hence $\mathcal{Z}^t(n, K)_{k, h}$ has dimension $2nk - k^2 + 2(n-k)t - t^2 + h - t$.

We get the claim for symmetric and antisymmetric matrices in the same way, by using also Theorem 1.2. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2. We proceed by induction on n , since the claim is obvious for $n = 1$. Let $n > 1$. By Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 the claim is true if h or k is 0 or n , hence we assume $h, k \neq 0, n$.

Let \mathcal{A} be an open subset of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$ and $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A}$; we want to prove that there exists $(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that \hat{A} or \hat{B} is not nilpotent. In fact, then by Lemma 2.3 we may apply the inductive hypothesis and get the claim. Let A and B be nilpotent. If $B = 0$, since $M(n, K)_k \times \{0\} \subset \mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$ we get the claim by Theorem 1.3. Let $B \neq 0$ and let $u_1 \geq \dots \geq u_t$ be the orders of the Jordan blocks of B . We may assume that B is in Jordan canonical form and regard A to be a block matrix $(A_{jl})_{j, l}$, $j, l = 1, \dots, t$, as in Lemma 2.4. Let $x \in K$. Suppose that there exist $j, l \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ such that $u_j = u_l = u_1$ and $\mathrm{rank} A_{jl} = u_1$. For any $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ let A_s and A^s be, respectively, the s th row of blocks of A and the s th column of blocks of A . If $j \leq l$ and we add xA^l to A^j we get a matrix which has the same rank as A and, by Lemma 2.4, commutes with B , but for a general choice of x it is not nilpotent (since the diagonal entries of its block of indices (j, j) depend on x). The same if $j > l$ and we add xA_j to A_l . Suppose that for any $j, l \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ such that $u_j = u_l = u_1$ $\mathrm{rank} A_{jl} < u_1$. If we substitute the entry of indices $(1, 1)$ of B with x and we add to any row of A of index belonging to $\{2, \dots, u_1\}$ the previous row multiplied by $-x$, we get two matrices which have, respectively, the same ranks as B and A and commute, but for $x \neq 0$ the first one is not nilpotent. By these observations we get the claim. \square

As a corollary of the proof of Proposition 2.2 we get the following result.

Corollary 2.5. *The subset of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$ of all the pairs of simultaneously diagonalizable matrices is dense.*

Proof. By Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 if h or k is 0 or n the claim is true. Otherwise, since by the proof of Proposition 2.2 the subset of $\mathcal{M}(n, K)_{k, h}$ of all the pairs (A, B) such that A or B is not nilpotent is dense, we get the claim by Lemma 2.3 and induction on n . \square

References

- [1] R. Basili, On the irreducibility of varieties of commuting matrices, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 149 (2000) 107–120, this issue.
- [2] J.P. Brennan, M.V. Pinto, W.V. Vasconcelos, The Jacobian Module of a Lie algebra, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 321 (1990) 183–196.
- [3] J.P. Brennan, On the normality of commuting varieties of symmetric matrices, *Comm. Algebra* 22 (15) (1994) 6409–6415.
- [4] C. De Concini, C. Procesi, A characteristic free approach to invariant theory, *Adv. Math.* 21 (1976) 330–354.
- [5] F.R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices*, Chelsea, New York, 1959.
- [6] M. Gerstenhaber, On dominance and varieties of commuting matrices, *Ann. Math.* 73 (1961) 324–348.
- [7] R.M. Guralnick, A note on commuting pairs of matrices, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 31 (1992) 1–4, 71–75.
- [8] R.M. Guralnick, A note on pairs of matrices with rank one commutator, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 8 (1979) 97–99.
- [9] K. Hulek, A remark on certain matrix varieties, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 10 (1981) 169–172.
- [10] G.R. Kempf, On the collapsing of homogeneous bundles, *Invent. Math.* 37 (1976) 229–239.
- [11] T.S. Motzkin, O. Taussky, Pairs of matrices with Property L II, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 80 (1955) 387–401.
- [12] M.G. Neubauer, The variety of pairs of matrices with rank $[A, B] \leq 1$, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 105 (4) (1989) 787–792.
- [13] D.I. Panyushev, The Jacobian modules of a representation of a lie algebra and geometry of commuting varieties, *Compositio Math.* 94 (1994) 181–199.
- [14] R.W. Richardson, Commuting varieties of semisimple lie algebras and algebraic groups, *Compositio Math.* 38 (1979) 311–327.
- [15] H.W. Turnbull, A.C. Aitken, *An Introduction to the Theory of Canonical Matrices*, Dover, New York, 1961.
- [16] H. Weyl, *The Classical Groups*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1946.